LIBRARY OF PRINCETON
MAY 22 1956
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

LANGUAGE MONOGRAPHS

PUBLISHED BY THE
LINGUISTIC SOCIETY OF AMERICA

EDITED BY
GEORGE MELVILLE BOLLING
Ohio State University

HANS KURATH
Ohio State University

SAMUEL MOORE
University of Michigan

EDWARD SAPIR
University of Chicago

NUMBER V SEPTEMBER, 1930

DRAVIDIAN DEVELOPMENTS

BY

EDWIN H. TUTTLE

LINGUISTIC SOCIETY OF AMERICA
UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA, PHILADELPHIA

1930

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Foreword	5
Chief Sources	6
Spelling and Sounds	8
Characteristics	10
Personal Pronouns	28

FOREWORD

The fourth volume of the *Linguistic Survey of India* deals with Dravidian. It skips Tulu and Kodagu, and gives a specimen of Badaga without an account of its grammar. I have included these languages; the details of Badaga are my own work, taken mainly from a text apparently constructed by a native. Kuvi also is lacking in the *Linguistic Survey*: it was not generally known in 1906, when the fourth volume was printed.

Beside the geografic divisions of Dravidian, with Brâhui, Gôndi-Kui and Kurukh-Malto in the north, and Kanara-Tamil, Telugu and Tulu in the south, we may call the Gôndi-Kui group a central division for linguistic reasons. The central division includes Kuvi, Parji, the basis of Tulu, apparently the basis of Badaga, and perhaps Kolâmi, which is so little known that its linguistic position can hardly be determined. Kêlan may be considered a dialect of Tamil; Kodagu seems to have a Telugu basis. Kêlan is commonly called Malayâlam; Caldwell discusses the name Kêlan, with its variants, in his *Comparative Grammar*.

CHIEF SOURCES

Dravidic Studies.

Linguistic Survey of India.

The Gospel of Mark in Badaga (1897).

The New Testament in Tulu (1894).

A. H. Arden, *A Progressive Grammar of Common Tamil* (1910); *A Progressive Grammar of the Telugu Language* (1921).

T. G. Bailey, *A Panjabi Phonetic Reader* (1914); *Grammar of the Shina Language* (1924).

J. Bloch, *La formation de la langue marathe* (1920); *Langues dravidiennes*, in *Les langues du monde* (1924); *Sanskrit et dravidien*, in the *Bulletin de la Société de Linguistique* (1924).

P. O. Bodding, *Materials for a Santali Grammar* I (1922).

D. de S. Bray, *The Brahui Language* I (1909).

J. Brigel, *A Grammar of the Tuḷu Language* (1872).

J. Bucher, *A Kannaḍa-English School-Dictionary* (1899).

R. Caldwell, *A Comparative Grammar of the Dravidian or South-Indian Family of Languages* (1913, reprinted from 1875).

R. A. Cole, *An Elementary Grammar of the Coorg Language* (1867).

J. Drake, *A Grammar of the Kúrkú Language* (1903).

J. E. Friend-Pereira, *A Grammar of the Kūi Language* (1909).

L. J. Frohnmeyer, *A Progressive Grammar of the Malayalam Language* (1913).

W. Geiger, *Etymologie des Balūčī* (1890), *Lautlehre des Balūčī* (1891), *Etymologie und Lautlehre des Afghānischen* (1893), *Etymologie des Singhalesischen* (1899), in the Bavarian Academy's *Abhandlungen.*

L. H. Gray, *Indo-Iranian Phonology* (1902).

G. A. Grierson, *A Manual of the Kāshmīrī Language* (1911); *Ishkashmi, Zebaki, and Yazghulami* (1920).

A. Grignard, *An Oraon-English Dictionary* (1924),

H. Gundert, *A Malayalam and English Dictionary* (1872).

F. Hahn, *Kuruk͟h Grammar* (1900).

A. F. R. Hoernle, *A Comparative Grammar of the Gaudian Languages* (1880).

F. Kittel, *A Kannaḍa-English Dictionary* (1894); *A Grammar of the Kannaḍa Language* (1903).

L. Letchmajee, *An Introduction to the Grammar of the Kui or Kandh Language* (1902, reprinted from 1853).

D. L. R. Lorimer, *Pashtu* I (1915).

A. Männer, *Tuḷu-English Dictionary* (1886).

W. E. Marshall, *A Phrenologist amongst the Todas* (1873).

G. Morgenstierne, *An Etymological Vocabulary of Pashto* (1927).

H. Morris, *Simplified Grammar of the Telugu Language* (1890).

T. Navarro Tomás, *Manual de pronunciación española* (1918).

P. Percival, *Telugu-English Dictionary* (1862).

R. Pischel, *Grammatik der Prakrit-Sprachen* (1900).

G. U. Pope, *A Handbook of the Ordinary Dialect of the Tamil Language* (1911).

L. V. Ramaswami Aiyar, *A Brief Account of Malayalam Phonetics* (1925).

E. P. Rice, *A History of Kanarese Literature* (1921).

F. V. P. Schulze, *A Grammar of the Kuvi Language* (1911).

P. T. Srinivas Iyengar, *tæmil*, in the *Maître phonétique* (1913).

C. G. C. Trench, *Grammar of Gondi* I (1919), II (1921).

E. H. Tuttle, *Dravidian Researches*, in the *American Journal of Philology* (1929).

J. Vinson, *Manuel de la langue tamoule* (1903).

J. Wackernagel, *Altindische Grammatik* I (1896).

W. D. Whitney, *A Sanskrit Grammar* (1891).

M. de Z. Wickremasinghe, *Tamil Grammar* (1906); *Sinhalese Self-taught* (1916); *Malayalam Self-taught* (1927).

W. W. Winfield, *A Grammar of the Kui Language* (1928).

M. Winslow, *A Comprehensive Tamil and English Dictionary* (1862).

ABBREVIATIONS

ac = accusative
d = dative
g = genitive

SPELLING AND SOUNDS

Subscript dots are not easy to read, and sometimes disappear in the course of printing. I have therefore used prefixt dots instead to mark reverted linguals : *.t .d .n .s .ʒ .l .r.* Other consonant-symbols are labial *p b m f v w*; dental or alveolar *t d n* θ ð *s ʒ š ǯ l r ;* prepalatal *c* (Bohemian T'), ζ (Bohemian D'), *ñ* (Spanish Ñ), *ç* (German CH in ECHT), *j* (German J), λ (Portuguese LH); postpalatal or velar *k g ŋ x* γ ; glottal ʾ (Arabic hamzah) and *h; ř* for palatalized *r ; 'p 't 'c 'k* for glottalized occlusives. Capitals, as *N L R,* mean voiceless sounds.

A Portuguese til (as *ã*) marks nasalized vowels; an angular circumflex (as *â*) means length combined with main stress ; a grave accent (as *à*) means variable or uncertain length; in Kodagu, Tulu and spoken Tamil, *ï* is apparently a close mediopalatal vowel like Rumanian î ; *ë* corresponds to our neutral E in BAKERY ; *ę* is like our A in HAT. In theoretic forms a breve marks vowels of unknown quality : *ă* (in general), *ĕ* (probably *e* or *i*), *ŏ* (probably *o* or *u*), *ŭ* (probably *u* or *i*).

In dealing with literary languages, *c* and ζ are used to transliterate ancient simple occlusives. In modern speech these occlusives have developt to affricates resembling those of English CHARGE; Telugu has *ts* and *dʒ* before non-palatal vowels.

Tamil script represents all occlusives as being voiceless; such a sound-system, except for foren words, is found in spoken Kêlan, as described by Ramaswami Aiyar. Spoken Tamil has a fricative resembling *ç* for initial *c* and for intervocalic *c* ; otherwise it has a voiced sound, where an occlusive-symbol is written singly, between voiced sounds. Fricatives may replace the voiced occlusives between vowels.

Corresponding to the written *R*-symbol, spoken Tamil has a strongly trilled *r* between vowels, alveolar *dr* after *n*, alveolar *t* or *r* before a consonant ; and corresponding to *RR*, alveolar *tt* or *ttr*. Modern Kanara and modern Telugu have *r* for older *R*. Modern Kanara has *.l* for older *.r*, and the same change is common in spoken Tamil.

Vinson assumes that the modern sound-system of Tamil was in use when the language was first written:

> Ce qui est certainement remarquable, c'est l'intelligente habileté avec laquelle l'alphabet tamoul a été composé : on y trouve la preuve d'une observation très exacte et très raisonnée; cet alphabet est évidemment l'œuvre d'un grammairien, ou d'un groupe de grammairiens, étranger et fort instruit qui, tenant compte des lois de la phonétique, a compris qu'un même signe suffisait pour *k* et *g*, *t* et *d*, *p* et *b* ; ...

This theory of a highly simplified spelling cannot well be maintained. In the spelling of early Tamil it was customary to ignore the difference between *ē*, *ō*, and short *e* and *o*. If the authors of Tamil spelling neglected to indicate certain vowel-lengths, evidently they did so because their model, used for writing Sanskrit, failed to provide any means of marking the difference. And evidently their respect for that model would have led them to distinguish voiced and voiceless occlusives, if such a distinction was made in spoken Tamil. The spelling of Tamil represents its ancient sounds. I here transcribe Tamil in accord with its spelling. Kêlan has a corresponding system of spelling for native words, and it is here transcribed as Tamil is. Certain varieties of spoken Kêlan have voiced the simple occlusives between voiced sounds, parallel with what is found in spoken Tamil.

In Gôndi and southern Dravidian the sound *j* is often added before an initial palatal vowel, and *v* before an initial *o*-sound or *u*-sound. These added consonants seem to have generally no historic value except as hiatus-fillers, and may therefore be usually disregarded in transcriptions.

Tulu distinguishes the sounds *e* and *ẹ*, but the ordinary spelling, in Kanara script, writes them alike. In transcriptions Brigel fails to mark the difference. I have therefore had to use *e* for both sounds, in accord with Brigel's faulty method, except in a few cases where Männer's transcriptions show the difference.

In early Kanara the neutral nasal-sign (o) was used for a final nasal element commonly transcribed *m*. This final nasal may correspond to modern *-vu*, *-nu* or zero. Where it corresponds to a modern *-nu* without the variant *-vu*, it would perhaps be better to transcribe it as *n*. I write *n* in the nominatives *ān* I, *nīn* YOU, *tān* SELF, *ēn* WHAT.

CHARACTERISTICS

1. Ancient *s* is generally lost in southern Dravidian, but a special feature of the Kanara-Tamil group is the reduction of initial *sn* to *n* in Kanara *nō.d-*, Tamil *nōkk-* (<**nō.tk-*) LOOK AT. Elsewhere initial *sn* became *sN*, and the *N* changed to *t* or zero. A feature separating Kanara-Tamil from Telugu and Tulu is the development of **pitar* thru **picar* to Kanara *pesar*, Tamil *pejar* NAME, *t* being palatalized by the preceding *i*. A similar development, likewise lacking in Telugu and Tulu, is found in Tamil *mujal, mucal* < **mical* < **mitȧl* < **midal* HARE; the Kanara form *mola*, instead of **mosal* corresponding to the Tamil forms, is a loan-word from Gôndi, which has *malōl* < **molal* < **mudal* < **midal*. Palatalized *nt* is represented in Kanara *īs-* < **īc-* < **īñc-* < **īnt-*, also *īζ-* < **īñζ-* < **īñc-* < **īnt-*, beside Tamil *nīñc-* < *nīnt-* (with *n-* from *nīr* WATER), against Telugu *īd-* < *ī̄d-* <**īnd-* SWIM. A change of *tl* to *cl*, similar to the Italian development in SECCHIA < **sekkλa* < SITVLA, appears in Kanara *sikk-* BE CAUGHT, BE FOUND, with the variants *siluk-*, *silk-* < **cilk-* < **sclik-* < **stlik-* < **slik-*, corresponding to Tamil *cikk-*, Telugu *cikk-*, against Tulu *tikk-* < **stlik-* < **slik-*, Gôndi *hilk-* < **silk-* < **slik-*; but perhaps the Tulu word was borrowed from early Kanara.

2. Kanara has *s* for *c* not in contact with a consonant, as in the words just mentioned, *pesar*, *īs-*, *sikk-*. Double *c* is kept: *eccu* is the past participle of *is-*, *es-* THROW, parallel with *ko.t.tu* from *ku.d-*, *ko.d-* GIVE. Developments of *s* from *c* are found in Brâhui, Gôndi, Kui, Telugu, Tulu and perhaps Kurukh-Malto. In Kanara *kēsu* and *kisu* < **kesu* RED, variants of *ken* < **kenso*, the *s* is not connected with ancient *s*; it was taken from *pasu* (= Tamil *pacu*) GREEN. To explain Kanara *ζēn* HONEY, *sī* SWEET, beside Tamil *tēn* and *tī*, we may assume the development *ζ̣ēn* < **cēn* < **tiēn* < **tēn*, and a change of **tī* to **cī* under the influence of **cēn*.

3. Under *.s* in Kittel's dictionary we read: 'It does not occur in pure Kannaḍa.' This assertion is given as a quotation from the 'stan-

dard early authority' on Kanara. It is not clear whether the early authority spoke a dialect having no *.s*, or made a false statement, as Bucher does in repeating the quoted words with nothing to mark them as a quotation. Kanara has *.s* in *a.s.tu* SO MUCH, *i.s.tu* SO MUCH, *e.s.tu* HOW MUCH, and other words. The word *a.s.ṭu* is derived from **actu*, with a Sanskrit-like treatment of *ct;* the ending is the ordinary neuter-ending *-tu*, and the stem is shown by *āsu* (< **ȧc–*) SO MUCH. Likewise *i.s.tu* corresponds to *īsu* SO MUCH, and *e.s.tu̇* to *ēsu* HOW MUCH.

4. Modern Kanara has, like the neighboring Marâti, developt the sound *š* from *s* before palatal vowels. This *š* is commonly represented by the *ç*-symbol. Otherwise there is no *ç* in native Kanara words. In Caldwell's *Comparative Grammar* we find '*š*' for *s* in a few Kanara words. Apparently Caldwell, after writing *s* for the fricative sound of Tamil *c*, changed it to '*š*' in his manuscript, and wrongly made the same change in some of the Kanara words. This blunder is kept in the 'revised' reprint of the book.

5. A remarkable development, apparently without general parallels in the other Dravidian tongues, is the Kanara change of *-al* to *-a.l* after *r : ara.l* beside *aral* < *alar* = Tamil *alar* BLOSSOM; *bera.l* beside *beral* = Tamil *viral* FINGER. Modern Kanara has assimilated *r* and *.r* to following consonants: *ippattu* < *irpattu* < **irŏpat* = Tamil *iruvatu*, *irupatu* TWENTY ; *ibbaru* < *irbar* < *irvar* < **irŏhar* = Tamil *iruvar* TWO PERSONS; *omme* < *orme* ONCE; *katte* < *ka.rte* < **khāřtas* < **ghauritas* = Tamil *ka.rutai* ASS; *iddu* < *irdu* < **irudu̇* < **iruntu* = Tamil *iruntu* BEEN; *kanna.da* < **karnā.ta* KANARA; *akki* < **arki* < **arighi* < **rīghi* < **wrīghia* = Tamil *arici* RICE. These Kanara developments have done away with the old rule, still unchanged in spoken Tamil, of having only voiceless sounds for doubled occlusives, in native words.

6. Kanara differs from Tamil in having initial *b* for *v*. The same change of *v* to *b*, evidently under the influence of Kanara, is found in Badaga, Kodagu, and Tulu. It is also found in Brâhui ; and in the northeastern tongues, Kurukh, Malto, and a portion of Kui, which are neighbors of Aryan tongues having *b* for *v*. The change of medial *v* to *b*, in contact whith a consonant, falls within the historic period of Kanara : *ibbaru* < *irbar* < *irvar* TWO PERSONS. The Kanara development of *b* from *v* caused a dialectal strengthening, for distinctness, of *p* to *ph*, which changed thru *f* to *h* where it was not in contact with a consonant, and the use of *h* spread until it was general enough to

be adopted in literary Kanara: *hattu* < *pattu* TEN, but *ippattu* < *irpattu* TWENTY.

7. Kanara has generally lost checking nasals except after a main-strest short vowel: *ondu* ONE, *era.du* TWO, *mūRu* THREE, *aidu* FIVE, beside Tamil *onRu*, *ira.n.tu*, *mūnRu*, *aintu*. Similar developments are found in Telugu *mū.du* < *mū̃.du* < **mū.n.du* THREE, *ȧidu* < **aindu* FIVE, and in Tulu *mūdǯi* = Kui *mùndǯi* THREE. From Telugu *re.n.du* TWO, beside *velug-* = Tamil *vi.laŋk-* SHINE, it appears that stress-displacement was earlier than the loss of nasals after weak vowels. An early borrowing from Kanara is represented in Tulu *ra.d.dï* TWO, which has replaced a native form resembling Gôndi *ra.n.d* or Kui *rī.n.de*:

8. If the evidence of native spelling can be trusted, all occlusives were voiceless in early Tamil. Probably the same thing was once true of Kanara, which has *h* and *p* for Aryan *bh* in *hubbu* < *pubbu* < *purbu* < *purvu* BROW. Spoken Tamil agrees with Kanara in generally having a voiced sound for a single occlusive between voiced sounds, either as an ancient medial or as a medialized initial in compounds. In Kanara the change of initial *v* to *b* upset the principle, still fixt for native words in spoken Tamil, that the initial occlusive of an isolated word must be voiceless, and made easy the use of initial *d* and *g* by extension from the medialized initials of compounds. Such an extension is to be seen in Kanara *gej-*, a variant of *kej-* = Tamil *cej-* DO, based on Aryan *kia* DONE.

9. Kanara has simplified double occlusives after a long or weak-strest vowel. Such an occlusive may become voiced after a weak vowel, as in *nambige* beside *nambike* = Tamil *nampikkai* TRUST. Tamil has developt a voiceless fricative (written as *c*) and also *j* from *c*, sometimes in the same word: *mucal* and *mujal* HARE, *arici* and *ari* < **ariji* RICE. This marks a difference between two ancient dialects: in one of them *c* became an affricate early enough to escape the voicing that affected simple occlusives. The presence or absence of voicing may sometimes depend on assimilation. Thus Kanara *tu.ti* LIP, instead of normal **tu.di* = Tamil *tu.ti*, seems to have *.t* because of the initial *t*.

10. Ancient *s* and *.s* have disappeared in southern Dravidian, except in one dialect of Tulu, which is a displaced central tongue. Common hiatus-fillers are *j*; *v* < *w*; *(g)g* < *gw* < *w*. Tamil examples are *ājira-m* < **sāsĕra* < *sahasra* THOUSAND; *ïja-m* < *sīsa* LEAD; *pū.n*

< *bhū.sa.na* ORNAMENT; *karu(m)* < **karn* < *kr.s.na* BLACK; *avan* < **asan* HE; *ava.n* < **asa.n* THERE; *mūkku* < **mūg* < **mugwo* < **muwo* < **muso* NOSE. The change of *s* thru *h* to zero has well-known parallels in Greek and Singhalese. The ending **-as* became *-ai* in early Kanara-Tamil, in accordance with Italian POI < POST: Tamil *talai*, Kanara *tale* < **talai* < **talas* HEAD.

11. From apparently trustworthy accounts of Bengâli, Panjâbi, Singhalese, and Telugu, it seems that *l* and *n* are commonly alveolar in these tongues, not dental except in contact with other dentals; a similar description of Spanish *l* and *n* is given by Navarro Tomás. Tamil *l* is likewise said to be alveolar; it is not found in contact with a dental in the same word. Tamil *l* combines with *tt* to make *RR*, and with *t* to make *R* or *RR*, presumably thru *(t)tr*. In early Tamil we find *hR* as a variant of *R* apparently derived from *lt*; the real source was perhaps *lst*, which became *str*. Another source of Tamil *R* is *.tr*, as in *onRu* < **o.n.trŭ* < **oro.n.tŭ* ONE, beside *oru* ONE, *ira.n.tu* TWO, *iru* TWO. A common source is *l*, made voiceless by a following sound, as in *kaRpēn* for **kalppēn* I SHALL LEARN. In Tamil *anRu* = *a nnā.l* THAT DAY, *inRu* = *i nnā.l* TODAY, we find *nR* derived from *n-.l*, apparently thru *.n.dr* and *.n.tr*.

12. Northern spoken Tamil has *j* for *.r*. This seems to imply palatalized *r* as a source of Kanara-Tamil *.r*. Similarly Kurukh has *ui-* = Tamil *u.r-* PLOW. Apparently Tamil *ku.ri* PIT and Telugu *gojji* PIT came from **kuria*: both languages have *i* for *a* after a palatal, and Telugu has *o* for *u* before an ancient *a*. If Aryan *sū̆rja* SUN is the source of Tamil *ū.r* SUNSHINE, the loss of the final vowel, against *ku.ri* < **kuřa* < **kuria*, could have resulted from the length of the stem-vowel, just as in early English nouns the plural-ending -U is lost after a long stem-syllable. A basis **marăcŏ*, changing to **marcŏ* in Gôndi and to **marăζŏ*, **marăjŏ*, **marjŏ*, **mařŏ* in Tamil, would explain Gôndi *mars* = Tamil *ma.ru* AX; *r* prevents voicing of a following sound in central Dravidian as it does in the southern tongues, for example in Kanara *irpattu* TWENTY beside *aivattu* FIFTY. For Kanara *kattu* NECK, THROAT, corresponding to Tamil *ka.ruttu*, Telugu *kuttika* < *kruttika*, Brâhui *gu.t*, Kurukh *xēser*, *xesr-*, we may assume a basis **kerust*, which became **kers* in Kurukh, **krust*, **kurst* (**ku.L.t ?*), **ku.s.t* in Brâhui, **krust* in Telugu, **kerst*, **krest*, **kriast*, **křatt*, **kařtt* in Kanara-Tamil, and **kařutt* in Tamil. Kanara verb-stems commonly correspond closely to their Tamil equivalents; among the few exceptions are *pē.r-* against

Tamil *pēc-* SPEAK, and *nō.d-* against Tamil *nōkk-* LOOK AT, beside the noun *nō.ta* < *nō.t.tam = Tamil *nō.t.tam* SIGHT, with a normal reduction after the long vowel (9). The Tamil infinitive-ending is sometimes *-a* and sometimes *-ka* ; I have explained the variation in *Dravidian Researches*. Evidently *nōkk-* stands for *nō.tk- or older *nō.dg-, the infinitive-stem used as a general verb-stem. Likewise *pēc-* represents *pēřc- < *pēřk-, the infinitive-stem with *k* palatalized by the preceding sound, just as *t* was palatalized by *i* in *pejar* < *picar < *pitar NAME. Thus it is clear that palatalized *r* was a source of Kanara-Tamil *.r*, tho we cannot say that it was the only source. Early Kanara has *.r* for *.d* in contact with a consonant, the future of *nō.d-* being either *nō.duvem* or *nō.rpem*.

13. The Tamil alfabet has two *n*-symbols, which may be transcribed as n^1 and n^2 : n^1 is written initially and in the group *nt* ; n^2 is used otherwise in native words. In borrowed words n^1 may be written between vowels, to represent Sanskrit *n*. The sound of n^1 is said to be dental ; n^2 is alveolar. Ramaswami Aiyar asserts that spoken Tamil lacks dental *n*, and that 'Tamilians are ridiculed' by Kêlans for using alveolar *n* instead of dental *n* initially. His statement ignores the group *nd* (written *nt*), which is presumably dental. Srinivas Iyengar declares that Tamil *t d n l* are dental, and says nothing about the generally admitted alveolar sounds. Vinson describes *l* and n^2 as being palatalized, or preceded by an *i*-like sound, at the end of a syllable. Wrongly supposing that Vinson's statements have historic importance, Bloch assumes that n^2 corresponds to an ancient palatalized sound of Dravidian in general (*Langues dravidiennes*). This is like saying that Latin NN must have regularly had a palatalized quality, on the ground that its derivative is the sound *ñ* in Catalan and Spanish.

14. In many varieties of early Dravidian a voiceless sound unvoiced a preceding nasal, *.l*, or *l*. Tamil examples are the adjectives *iruppu* with *pp* < *Mpp* < *mbb*, *maruttu* with *tt* < *Ntt* < *ndd*, beside the substantives *irumpu* IRON, *maruntu* MEDICINE ; the infinitive *kē.tka* and the future *kē.tpēn* from *kē.l* ASK, HEAR, with *.t* for *.L* ; the infinitive *kaRka* and the future *kaRpēn* from *kal-* LEARN, with *R* for *L*. There seems to be nothing to justify Caldwell's theory that in such cases a nasal was not radical and was added before a single consonant. Probably *maruntu* is a derivative of Aryan *mantra* CHARM, borrowed too late for *N* to develop from *n*, and too late for *tr* to become *R* ; *irumpu* may be connected with one of the Turkish equivalents, *demir, timir, timur*, thru something like **idimur* and **irimbru*, with a dissimilative loss of the second *r*. We may assume that single occlusives were unvoiced later than double ones in Kanara-Tamil (or general Dravidian). After *mbb* had become *pp* in *iruppu*, *mb* became *mp* in *irumpu*, too late for an unvoicing of the *m*. In spoken Tamil an occlusive is regularly voiced after a nasal of the same word: apparently a similar condition existed in early Kanara-Tamil, before the general unvoicing of occlusives. Beside the ordinary unvoicing of Tamil *l* in contact with an occlusive, as shown by *kaRka* and *kaRpēn*, we sometimes find *l* kept, for example in *alkal*, a variant of *aRkal* STAYING, from the root of *alla* IS NOT. This retention of *l* seems to represent a period earlier than the unvoicing of simple occlusives. Apparently *alkal* came from a form with *g*, and *aRkal* from a variant with *gg*. The unvoicing of double occlusives was early enough to change *l* to *L;* the unvoicing of simple occlusives was too late to affect *l*.

15. In his discussion of Sanskrit and Dravidian, Bloch says: 'le dravidien n'admet pas de cérébrales initiales', and infers that Dravidian influence cannot be held to explain the use of initial reverted linguals in Aryan. This inference would be interesting if it had any basis, but the supposed basis is a false statement. It would be nearer the truth to say that all of the Dravidian languages admit initial reverted linguals. On a single page of the word-lists in the *Linguistic Survey of India* (one of Bloch's sources), I find Gôndi *.tālī* COW, Kui *.dēŋgā* HIGH, Malto *.da.di* FEMALE. Telugu has initial *.d* in *.debbhai* SEVENTY. In Kittel's dictionary (one of Bloch's sources), more than a hundred Kanara words, markt as native by the use of heavy-face type, begin with *.t* or *.d*. In Tamil no reverted linguals begin isolated forms of native words, but they may begin combined forms, as in *ta.n .nīr* COLD WATER beside *nīr* WATER. We may reasonably reverse Bloch's statement and say that Dravidian influence would certainly explain the Aryan use of initial reverted linguals.

16. If a final consonant follows a main-strest short vowel, it is regularly doubled before a word or suffix beginning with a vowel, in Kanara and Tamil; thus Kanara has modern *kallu*, *ka.n.nu*, for older *kal* STONE, *ka.n* EYE, beside *avaru* for older *avar* THEY, and Tamil has *kaRka.l* and *kalluka.l* as plurals of *kal* STONE. This explains Tamil *pattu* TEN, beside *-patu* in its multiples and *patin-* -TEEN. Perhaps *pattu* and the variant *pahtu* came from Aryan *paŋkti* in the sense of LARGE

NUMBER, with _ŋ_ unvoiced and lost as explained above (**14**). From an early Dravidian form _*paxti_ or _*pahti_ were developt Kanara _padin-_, Tamil _patin-_ -TEEN, and Gôndi _pad_, Telugu _padi_ TEN. Isolated _*pahti_ lost its final vowel in Kanara-Tamil; later, when _-u_ was added to final occlusives, the main-strest form became Kanara _pattu_, Tamil _pahtu_ and _pattu_, but a weaker stress left the simple occlusive unchanged, as in Tamil _irupatu_, _iruvatu_ TWENTY. The influence of _pattu_ changed _*-patu_ to _-pattu_ in Kanara, which has _irpattu_ < _*irŏpat_. The doubling of finals is seen also in Tulu _ka.n.nï_, Telugu _kannu_ < _*ka.n_ EYE.

17. Kanara commonly has _e_ for _i_ and _o_ for _u_ before one of the more open vowels (chiefly _a_ or _e_ < _ai_): _era.du_ = Tamil _ira.n.tu_ TWO; _modal_ = Tamil _mutal_ FIRST. Parallel developments are found in Telugu and spoken Tamil, but seem to be lacking in Tulu, except in words influenced by or borrowed from Kanara. Weak-strest _ai_ has become _e_ in Kanara: _ele_ = Tamil _ilai_ LEAF. The same change is common in spoken Tamil. In Kanara, as in Kurukh-Malto, _e_ and _o_ undergo harmonic closure: _kisu_ < _*kesu_ beside lengthened _kēsu_ RED; _kivi_ = Tamil _cevi_ EAR; _ku.du_ = Tamil _ko.tu_ GIVE; _kuRi_ = Tamil _koRi_ SHEEP. Kanara drops weak vowels more freely than Tamil: _akki_ < _*arki_ < _*ariki_ < _*rīghi_ < _*wrīghia_ = Tamil _arici_ < _*rīζhi_ < _*wrīghia_ RICE; _iddu_ < _irdu_ < _*irudu_ < _*iruntu_ = Tamil _iruntu_ BEEN. A contrary case is seen in Kanara _kā.nis-_ < _*kā.nic-_ < _*kā.nit-_ < _*kā.nitt-_ = Tamil _kā.t.t-_ < _*kā.N.t.t-_ < _*kā.nitt-_ SHOW. In Kanara _ibbaru_ < _irbar_ < _irvar_ < _*iruwar_ < _*irŏhar_, corresponding to Tamil _iruvar_ TWO PERSONS, the loss of _u_ was too late for a change of _i_ to _e_. If Aryan _vjāghra_ TIGER is the basis of Kanara _bekku_ < _berku_ CAT, the Tamil form _veruku_ is an expansion of _*verkŏ_ < _*verghŏ_.

18. The _Linguistic Survey_ puts Badaga among the dialects of Kanara. In its fonology, morfology and vocabulary there is much that agrees with Kanara. But instead of _-u_, the ending of the neuter plural in Kanara, Badaga has _-e_ corresponding to Tamil _-ai_, now sounded as _ei_ or _e_. This shows that if Badaga belongs in southern Dravidian, its basis is Tamil rather than Kanara. The old Tamil element has been largely replaced by Kanara equivalents. But the real basis is probably not southern; various features seem to imply a Gôndi basis.

19. A distinctive feature of Badaga is the use of _.r_ for _.l_ : _av.ra_ = Kanara _ava.l_, Tamil _ava.l_ SHE; _b.rē-_ = Kanara _be.le-_, Tamil _vi.lai_

GROW ; *k.rē-* = Kanara *kē.l-*, Tamil *kē.l-* ASK, HEAR. The anticipation, which regularly goes with the use of *.r* in Badaga, seems to mark the struggle to utter a foren sound. Gôndi has *.r*, but lacks *.l*. Instead of a word corresponding to Kanara *ibbaru* or Tamil *iruvar* TWO PERSONS, Badaga uses *era.d.rā*, the formal equivalent of Kanara *era.d ā.l* TWO-THING PERSON. Cognate with *ibbaru* and *iruvar*, Gôndi has *įru.r*, which may be translated COMPANY : it is not a true numeral, but is used in expressions of the type *marrī-iru.r* SON-COMPANY for SON AND FATHER. Ordinary Gôndi lacks a word for TWO PERSONS. Corresponding to Kanara *gej-* DO, MAKE, WORK, Gôndi has *kī-* : apparently a blend of the two forms is represented in Badaga *gī-* WORK. Similarly a blend of Gôndi *marrī* and Sanskritic Kanara (*ātma*)*ζāta* is perhaps to be seen in Badaga *māti* SON.

20. A remarkable Badaga development is the change of *a* to *o* in *mora* TREE, against Kanara *mara*, Tamil *maram*, Telugu *mrānu* (<* *mar...*), Tulu *mara* and Gôndi *ma.rā*. In Gôndi we find the variations *.to.d.dī* = *.tu.d.dī* MOUTH, *massōr* = *mussōr* NOSE, beside Tamil *tu.ti* LIP, Malto *muso* NOSE : in such cases evidently weak stress allowed the first vowel to vary. If a Badaga form **mo.rā*, developt as a variant of Gôndi *ma.rā*, came into contact with Kanara *mara*, a blending of the two forms might have produced *mora*.

21. In American English, as it is spoken in the neighborhood of New York, an apical *ā* is commonly used in such words as ARM and HARD : the tongue-tip is raised nearly to the *.r*-position at the beginning of the vowel, and held there thruout its duration. Badaga seems to have a similar apical *ā*, which may be written *.ā*. In compounds, after a consonant, Badaga has *-.rā* = Kanara *ā.l* PERSON. But when the same word stands alone, it is written as *ā* with the subscript form of the *.r*-symbol that is otherwise used only if the consonant is the final member of a group. This seems to imply the utterance of an apical *ā*.

22. The general sound-system of Kêlan is much like that of Tamil. According to Frohnmeyer, voiceless occlusives have a weak aspiration in Tamil (as in English), but not in Kêlan. According to Ramaswami Aiyar, spoken Kêlan has an affricate for initial *c*, and an affricate or a fricative for intervocalic *c* ; native occlusives are regularly voiceless ; dental *n* and alveolar *n* are distinguisht in speech tho not in writing ; the present sound of *R* is more reverted and more strongly trilled

than that of _r_. This reverted sound is said to be used instead of ordinary _r_ after voicelesss sounds in words taken from Aryan : an indication of the formerly voiceless quality of _R_.

23. Kêlan _pijar_, a variant of _pejar_ = Tamil _pejar_ NAME, is apparently an older form lost in Tamil. In Kanara and spoken Tamil we find vowel-changes of the type _e-a_ < _i-a_ and _o-a_ < _u-a_, but in written Tamil they are extremely rare, and it may be suspected that in Tamil _pejar_ <* _picar_ the development of _e_ came from the influence of the contracted form _pēr_, which probably has _ē_ for _ia_ in accord with Tamil _vēr_, a contracted form of _vijar_ < *_wisar_ SWEAT.

24. Gundert gives as a proverbial expression Kêlan _ñāŋ-kālam_ IN MY TIME, literally I-TIME. This use of a nominative, instead of the general stem as the first portion of a compound, is contrary to the ordinary principles of Dravidian speech, and seems to show that Kêlan was originally a creole dialect, representing Tamil learned defectively by adults who had a different native tongue.

25. The _Linguistic Survey_ puts Kodagu in the Kanara-Tamil group. It has taken much from Kanara and Tamil; an interesting form is _phūvu_ = Kanara _hūvu_ < _pūvu_ BLOSSOM, with the _ph_ that must be assumed for early Kanara (6). But from _d_ in Kodagu _peda_ < *_pitar_ NAME, against the Kanara-Tamil development *_picar_ < *_pitar_, it is clear that Kodagu stands outside of the Kanara-Tamil group. The form _peda_ has lost final _r_, in accord with _ibba_ = Kanara _irbar_ TWO PERSONS ; it corresponds to Telugu *_pedar_ < *_pitar_, and agrees with pronouns in pointing to Telugu as the basis of Kodagu.

26. Telugu, the northernmost of the southern tongues, shares various features with Gôndi and Kui. But it differs from them in the treatment of the root *_iti_ GIVE. In Telugu, as in Kanara-Tamil, the past *_itit-_ contracted to _itt-_ and produced the stem _ì-_. The past participle *_iticcì_, represented by the past _tiss_ in Brâhui, became *_ciccì_ in the other northern languages and produced the general stem *_ci–_ (Kurukh-Malto _tši–_, Gôndi-Kui _sī-_). The Telugu development of _sN_ thru _st_ to _t_ is shown in _cū.d-_ (< *_tū.d-_), _cūc-_ (< *_tū.dc-_) SEE. This verb, like many others in Telugu, has extended to forms of the present a suffixal _c_ belonging to the past participle ; *_tū.dcì_ became _cūci_, with double assimilation, and altered initial _t_ to _c_ in forms that have kept _.d_. In Telugu _pēru_ < *_prēr_ < *_pedar_ < *_pitar_ NAME, _kundēlu_ < *_madêl_ < *_medal_ < *_midal_ HARE, the palatalization of

Tamil *_picar_ and *_mical_ is lacking. The _d_ of *_pedar_ became _r_, in accord with _mrōlu_ = _modalu_ BEGINNING, and was lost by dissimilation before _r_ disappeared as a normal development in _mānu_ < _mrānu_ (= Tamil _maram_) TREE, _vēlu_ < _vrēlu_ (= Tamil _viral_) FINGER. The prefix of _kundēlu_ seems to be connected with Tamil _kuti-_ JUMP, Tulu _kudike_ FOX, *JUMPER. A special feature of Telugu is _p_ for _tw_ in _pojji_ FIREPLACE, beside _t_ in Tamil _tī_, Tulu _tū_ FIRE : apparently the development was _pojji_ < *_pwejja_ < *_twejja_ < *_twea_ < *_twia_, with hiatus-filling _j_ doubled for some reason not known, perhaps because of the shortness of the stem-vowel, just as hiatus-filling _g_ is doubled in _mugguru_, a variant of _mùguru_, _mūvuru_ < *_muhar_ THREE PERSONS.

27. In early Telugu, as in Gôndi and Kui, stress-displacement was common. It was often accompanied by sound-displacement or a change of vowel-length. Examples are _nà-_ beside _ana-_ in forms of _an-_ SAY; _kà-_ for *_aga-_ in forms of _ag-_ BECOME; _rà-_ for *_vara-_ (= Gôndi _va.rà-_) in forms of _va-_ < *_war-_ COME; _lē-_ = Kanara _illa_ IS NOT; _lē-_ = Kanara _è.r-_ RISE; _lō-_ = Kanara _ā.r-_ DIVE; _kondaru_ SOME, based on _okka_ ONE; _re.n.du_ = Tamil _ira.n.tu_ TWO; _.debbhai_, _.debbadi_ SEVENTY beside _ē.du_ SEVEN; _pēru_, _kundēlu_, _mrōlu_, _mrānu_, _vrēlu_, mentioned above.

28. Early Telugu shared with other Dravidian tongues the general principle of voicing a simple occlusive between voiced sounds, and of losing (thru unvoicing) a nasal directly followed by a voiceless sound that remained such. But in the known form of the language various changes have taken place. Thus _ka.n.ti_, the genitive of _kannu_ < *_ka.n_ EYE, represents *_ka.nătti_ or *_ka.n.nătti_, parallel with the uncontracted Kuvi genitive _mrānuti_ beside _mrānu_ TREE. Double consonants are simplified, as in Kanara, after a weak-strest or long vowel; frequent weakness of stress explains _oka_ for older _okka_ < *_otka_ ONE. If _k_ is the basic initial sound of _gurramu_ HORSE, beside _k_ in Tamil _kuti-_ JUMP, _kutirai_ HORSE, the _g_ could have come from its position between vowels, after _nā_ MY and _nī_ YOUR. Because of the regular change of _mb_ to _mm_ in Telugu, we find an alternation of _p_ (for _pp_ < _Mpp_ < _mbb_) and _m_ (for _mm_ < _mb_), as in the adjectives _gurrapu_, _inupa_, beside the substantives _gurramu_ HORSE, _inumu_ (= Tamil _irumpu_) IRON.

29. In Telugu, as in Kanara, _s_ stands for _c_ between vowels: the suffix of _cēsi_ < *_kiĕcì_ HAVING DONE corresponds to that of _vacci_ < *_warcì_ HAVING COME. In _cūci_ HAVING SEEN, _nilici_ HAVING STOOD, _c_

is a later reduction of *cc* after a long or weak vowel. Telugu has *s* for *c* before a consonant in *vastu* COMING, *cūstu* SEEING, *nilustu* STANDING. Ancient *.s* and *s* have disappeared, as in Kanara-Tamil : *alam-* = Kanara *ala(m)b-*, Tamil *alamp-*, Brâhui *šalāp-* WASH ; *mukku* = Kanara *mū*, *mùgu*, Tamil *mūkku*, Malto *muso* NOSE ; *lē-* = Kui *si.de* IS NOT. In Telugu *tala* < **talas* HEAD, perhaps the development was thru **talā* < **talau* < **talasu*, corresponding to Kui *tlau* < **talasu* < **talas*.

30. In Telugu, as generally also in northern Dravidian, *.l* and *.n* have lost their reversion except in contact with other reverted linguals : *kannu* < **ka.n* = Kanara *ka.n.nu* < *ka.n* EYE, *mullu* < **mu.l* = Kanara *mu.l.lu* < *mu.l* THORN. In plurals written with *-.tlu*, *-.dlu*, *-.llu*, as *mu.n.dlu*, *mu.llu* THORNS, the written *l* seems to be sounded *.l*. Telugu has *l* for *n* < *.n* in *kala* DREAM, because of dissimilation in the verb *kalagan-* < **kanākan-* < **ka.nau* **ka.n-*, literally SEE A DREAM, or SEE A VISION, *kala* being derived from the root of *kàn-* (= Kanara *kà.n-*) SEE. Apparently Telugu **kanā* was the source of Kanara *kana*, Tamil *kanā*, *kanavu* DREAM. Corresponding to Tamil *.r*, Telugu has *.d* in *ē.du* = *ē.ru* SEVEN, *kō.di* = *kō.ri* FOWL, *gā.dide* = *ka.rutai* < **khăřtas* ASS ; *r* in *proddu* = *po.rutu* TIME, *krī* = *kī.r* UNDER ; *l* in *lē-* RISE, *lō-* DIVE (27); and *jj* in *gojji* PIT (12). Perhaps *.d* represents the normal development at the end of a syllable : the *-u* of SEVEN is hardly radical, and the *-i* of FOWL may have been added from other animal-names.

31. In the *Linguistic Survey* Tulu is wrongly said to belong to the Kanara-Tamil group. In *Dravidian Researches* I have explained features that show the kinship of Tulu : initial *h* < *sn*, *s* < *sn*, *t* < *sn*, in three dialects, parallel with Gôndi *h* < *sn*, Kui *s* < *sn*, Telugu *t* < *sn*, against Kanara-Tamil *n* < *sn* ; *dž̧* < *dr* in accord with Kui *dž̧* < *dr* ; *r* < *l* beside Kui *.d* < *l* ; *o*-interrogatives, as in Kui ; two past tenses, as in Gôndi ; *ār* = Kui *aaru* THOSE ; *ī* YOU, lacking initial *n*, in agreement with Gôndi and Kui forms, against Kanara-Tamil *nī* < **ī* ; *in-* = Gôndi-Kui *in-* SAY, against Kanara-Tamil *an-*, *en-* ; a derivative of **waŋkiatro* INSIDE, in agreement with Gôndi and Kui forms, against derivatives of **wakiatro* in Kanara and Tamil ; no palatalization in *mu(g)ger* < **muar* < **mídal* HARE, *pudar* < **pitar* NAME, in agreement with Gôndi and Kui forms, against Tamil *mucal* < **mical* < **midal* and **picar* < **pitar*. To these may be added Tulu *-ge* IT IS SAID, corresponding to Kuvi *-ke*;

Kôi, a dialect of Gôndi, has the verb *ke-* SAY, but cognates seem to be lacking in Kanara-Tamil.

32. Gôndi, Kui and the basis of Tulu belong to a single division of Dravidian. An important feature of these tongues is the use of a large number of stem-vowels in demonstratives and interrogatives. Kui forms interrogatives from five vowels, *i e a o u*, and demonstratives from four, *i e a o*. In the other divisions of Dravidian the vowel *e* is the basis of all interrogatives, aside from the interjections *à* and *ò*. Gôndi, the southernmost of the northern tongues, has reduced the bases of demonstratives to the three found in Tulu and Tamil, *i a u*, but has redevelopt two other stem-vowels, *ē-* < **ia-* < **isa-* and *ō-* < **au-* < **awa-* < **asa-* in the masculine, beside neuter *id* and *ad*. Gôndi and Badaga, which probably has a Gôndi basis, are remarkable in letting regular sound-changes break up the formal unity of connected demonstratives. Instead of normal **eva* < **isan* HE, Kanara has *iva* with *i* from the influence of the neuter *idu* and of other words with *i*; but Badaga has normal *e* in *evã* < **isan*, and likewise in the neuter plural *eve* (= Tamil *ivai*), beside unchanged *i* in the neuter singular *idu*. Tulu has demonstratives from three bases, *i a u*, and interrogatives from two, *e* and *o*. This distribution of the basic vowels is not found in any other Dravidian tongue. The *u*-demonstratives of early Tamil and early Kanara are not now used. Aside from two Kanara words with *ō*, *ō.tu* SO MUCH and *ōsu* SO MUCH, the modern demonstratives of Kanara and Tamil have, like those of Telugu, the bases *i* and *a*. Beside *i*-forms and *a*-forms, Kurukh has *u*-demonstratives, generally with Kolarian *h* prefixt.

33. Another special feature of Gôndi-Kui (including Tulu) is the change of initial *sn* thru *sN* to *s*, later generally reduced to *h* in Gôndi, as also in one dialect of Tulu; the development to *t*, found in one dialect of Tulu, probably came from contact with Telugu. In Gôndi *pa.rōl* < **polar* < **pudar* < **pitar* NAME, *malōl* < **molal* < **mudal* < **midal* HARE, and Kui *pada* < **prdâ* < **pŭdra* < **pitar*, *mrā.du* < **mŭrâl* < **midal*, the palatalization of Tamil **picar* and **mical* is lacking. Gôndi levels *l* < *t* and *l* < *d*; it is not clear whether *d* is kept normally in Kui *pada*, or accidentally because of contact with *r* in **prdâ*. As Parji has *d* in *pidir* NAME, it seems likely that *d* < *t* and *r* < *d* represent a regular distinction in Kui, corresponding to the Tulu developments (31). A general unvoicing of occlusives, later than the change of *d* to *r*, is apparently implied by Kui *prāu* < **prāsu* < **prās* = Malay *bĕras* RICE; but perhaps the Kui word came from Telugu **prās*, a lost singular corresponding to the plural *prālu*.

34. From Gôndi *kis* = Kanara *kiccu* FIRE, it appears that the change of *c* to a fricative is more general in Gôndi-Kui than in Kanara-Tamil. But Gôndi has *-džī* and *-tšī* as variants of the participial ending *-sī* < **-cì*, showing retention of an affricate after *n* and other consonants. Ancient *s* has become *h* or zero in most varieties of Gôndi : *hillē* NOT beside Kui *si.de* IS NOT ; *hilk-* = Tamil *cikk-* < **cilk-* < **sclik-* < **slik-* BE CAUGHT, beside Kui *slik-* UNTIE, with a semantic change from condition to resultant action ; *ōn-* < **aun-* < **awan-* < **asan-* HIM ; *miār* = Brâhui *masi.r* DAUGHTER ; *talāhk* < **talaska.l* HEADS. Double *s* is kept in *mussōr* (20). In Gôndi *talā* < **talas* HEAD we should perhaps assume a development *-ā* < **-āu* < **-āsu* < **-as*, rather than a simple loss of final *s*. A few dialects of Gôndi keep ancient initial *s* ; some have *h* for *s* < *c*, as *hā-* instead of *sā-* = Tamil *cā-* DIE. Ancient *.s* seems to be represented by Gôndi *s* in *savvor* < **sovar* < **.suar* = Tamil *uvar* SALT, perhaps connected with Aryan *ū.sara* SALTY.

35. Apparently Gôndi developt an ancient *R* in accord with Kanara-Tamil. It makes a distinction between *r* = Kanara-Tamil *R* and *.r* = Kanara-Tamil *r* after a vowel : *sār-* = Kanara *āRu* SIX ; *nūr* = Kanara *nūRu* HUNDRED ; *ma.rā* = Kanara *mara* TREE ; *ō.r* = Kanara *avar* THEY. This difference shows that if the present sound of *R* is more reverted than that of *r* in Kêlan and Tamil, the reversion is not a fundamental quality, but was developt as a way of keeping the sounds separate when *R* became voiced. A blend of two words, corresponding to Tamil *kal-* LEARN and *aRi-* KNOW, is seen in Gôndi *karī-* LEARN. As the result of blending with a lost **na.rī* or older **narį* = Tamil *nari* FOX, we find *.r* instead of *l*, the normal derivative of *t* (33), in Gôndi *khēk.rī* = Tulu *kudike* FOX. A dissimilative influence of *.r* and *.s* seems to account for *r*, where we should expect *.r*, in Gôndi *iru.r* (19) and **.suar* (34).

36. The sound *.l* has become *l* in Gôndi : *kal-* = Tamil *ka.l-* STEAL. Likewise *.n* has become *n*, except in contact with *.t* or *.d* : *kan* = Tamil *ka.n* EYE. A special feature of Gôndi is the consonant-doubling connected with stress-displacement : *allī* = Tamil *eli* RAT; *annā* beside *anā* < **ēnēn* I. In such words, as in *malōl* (33), *miār*

(34), the long second vowel seems to show persistence of displaced stress.

37. Kui keeps initial *s* : *sal-* = Gôndi *han-* < **sln* GO; *sū.d-*, *sū.r-* = Gôndi *hu.d-*, *hu.r-* < **snu.d* SEE. But there is a dialectal change of initial *s* to *h*, in accord with the general Gôndi development. Ancient medial *s* seems to be kept before voiceless sounds but it was lost between vowels in Kui *a(v)an-* < **asan-* HIM, *mrau* < **miaru* < **masir* (= Brâhui *masi.r*) DAUGHTER, *tlau* < **talasu* < * *talas* HEAD. The form **talasu* is represented in Gârwi, a Dardic tongue having *.th* for *tr* in *.thă* THREE, and similarly *th* for *tl* in *thōs* < **ṭlōs* < **talos* HEAD, the change of **talasu* to **talos* being a normal Dardic development.

38. Kui has *.d* for *l* after vowels that are kept : *i.du* = Tamil *il* HOUSE; *o.dri* < **olri* < **orli* = Kuvi *orli* RAT, corresponding to Tamil *ōr eli* ONE RAT; *mrā:du* < **midal* HARE ; *kā.du* = Tamil *kāl*, Tulu *kār* FOOT ; but *tlau* = Tamil *talai*, Tulu *tarę* < **talas* HEAD. This development is much like the change of *l* to *r* in Tulu, and seems to show that the two languages are closely connected ; Tulu *tarę* may represent a loan from Tamil or Kanara, replacing an older Kui-like form. Kui *.l* is recorded in the dialect described by Friend-Pereira, but it seems to have been changed to *l* in other varieties of the language. Kui has the regular northern *n* for *.n* in *kạnu* EYE, beside *.n.d* in *rī.n.de* TWO. From Gôndi *pun-*, Kui *pun-*, Tulu *pin-* KNOW, beside Kanara *pū.n-* ACKNOWLEDGE, it appears that Tulu shared with Gôndi-Kui the change of *.n* to *n*, and that the influence of Kanara restored *.n* in Tulu words which more closely resembled the Kanara equivalents, as *ka.n.nĭ* EYE, *po.n.nu* < **pe.n* FEMALE.

39. Kui has the glottal occlusive as an element of its sound-system. Winfield recognizes it in negative verb-forms, where it may be distinctive ; but he ignores it in *tiʔi* I EAT, from *tin-* = Tamil *tin-*, and in parallel forms from other *n*-stems. His spelling '*tii*' is evidently wrong. Contact with a voiceless sound caused a nasal to disappear (14) : the form *tiʔi* explains the loss of *n*, while '*tii*' fails to do so. In negative-stems, as *tinʔ-*, we may assume contact with the glottal occlusive too late to affect the *n*.

40. Kuvi seems to be a near relative of Kui, modified by Telugu. A queer word-form is *.dōru* NAME. As Kuvi has *.d* for *dr* in *.dālu* = Kui *drā.du* YOUNG ANIMAL, we may assume *.dōru* < **drōr* < **durar*

< *dudar*, apparently a blend of **pudar* and inverted **dupar*. Equally queer are the demonstratives *ī ē hē hū*, beside Kui *ì è à ò*; the added *h* came from Kolarian influence, as in Kurukh *hū* beside *ī* and *ā*. Kuvi has initial *h* for old *s* and for *s* < *c* : *ha(n)-*, *hal-* = Gôndi *ha(n)-*, Kui *sal-* GO ; *hā-* = Gôndi *sā-*, Kui *sā-*, Tamil *cā-* DIE.

41. The *Linguistic Survey* calls Parji a dialect of Gôndi. A close relation to Kui is shown by various features : *dž* < *dr* in *sēdžēn* SIX, as in Kui *sadžgi*, against *r* in Gôndi *sāruŋg* (35) ; *ān* = Kui *ānu* < **ēn* I, against Gôndi *anā* < **ēnēn* ; *in* (or *īn* ?) = Kui *īnu* YOU, against Gôndi *immā* based on the plural ; *nā* = Kui *ina*, *ena*, *ana* WHAT, against Gôndi *bad* < **ămbàdŭ* connected with Kui *imb-*, *emb-*, *omb-*, *umb-* WHO. Remarkable is the conservative form of Parji *pidir* < **pitar* NAME, beside Gôndi *pa.rōl* and Kui *pàda* (33).

42. Kolâmi seems to have borrowed much from Telugu, but its general history is not clear. If the root **snu.d* is represented in *ōl-* SEE, we may assume the development of zero for *h* < *s* < *sn*, and of *l* for *.l* < *.d*, differing only slightly from ordinary Gôndi *h* < *sn* and *.r* < *.d*. To explain *ā.n.d-* BE, we might assume a blending of Gôndi *ānd-* and Telugu *u.n.d-*. In the forms *ān* I, *ām* WE, Kolâmi agrees with Kui, not with Gôndi.

43. In the northernmost Dravidian tongues voiceless consonants seem to have regularly remained such between vowels : Brâhui *bí.t-* = Kanara *bi.d-* THROW ; Malto *maxe* = Kanara *maga* SON. But early contact with a nasal caused voicing ; a remarkable case is Kurukh *o.toŋgas* CUT-THROAT, having the variant *ō̃.rkas* < **o.n.dokasan*, with varied voicing dependent on the position of the nasal element.

44. In Brâhui *xan*, Kurukh *xann*, Malto *xanu* = Kanara *ka.n* EYE, we find the usual northern *n* for *.n*, and a change of *k* or *kh* or *gh* to the fricative *x*. These languages have also a *k* (< *g* ?) corresponding to southern *k* and *g* : Brâhui *kēraγ*, Kurukh *kijjā* (< **kirja* < **kerγia* ?) = Kanara *kī.r*, Tamil *kī.r*, Telugu *krī* UNDER; Brâhui *pōk* LOST beside Kanara *pōgi* GONE ; Kurukh-Malto *ēk-* = Tamil *ēk-*, Telugu *ēg-* GO. Corresponding to Sanskrit *gōdhūma*, Brâhui has *xōlum* WHEAT : if it is not a native formation, thru **ghōdùma*, it was probably taken from Gôndi **ghōluma*, the change of *d* to *l* between vowels being normal in Gôndi. If Brâhui *gu.t* corresponds to Kurukh *xēser* (12), we may assume that initial *k* became *g* after **en* = Tamil *en* MY, the principle of voicing in contact with a nasal being shown for Brâhui by the past-ending _-g_, used after a nasal, beside _-k_ after other sounds; I have explained the history of the _k_-suffix in _Dravidian Researches_. Brâhui seems to have _.L_ < _rs_ in _ma.L_ SON (47): in the development of _gu.t_ we might assume a form _*ku.L.t_ between _*kurst_ and _*ku.s.t_, or instead of _*ku.s.t_. Brâhui _.L_ is apparently not found before a consonant of the same root, so a change of _*kurst_ to _*ku.t(h)_ could be normal, beside _ma.L_ < _*mars_. Corresponding to Brâhui _gu.t_, Balûchi has _gu.th_, a form that Morgenstierne mentions but leaves unexplained. Brâhui _dū_ HAND corresponds to Dardic _dui_, and Dardic _dōr_ MOUTH seems to have come from Brâhui _*dōr_, corresponding to Malto _toro_ MOUTH; we may assume that Balûchi _gu.th_ was taken from Brâhui.

45. A special feature of the northernmost tongues is the retention of _k_ in Brâhui _ka-_ < _*ke-_, Kurukh _khè-_, _ke-_, Malto _kei-_, _kej-_ DIE. Elsewhere, because of a change of the _e_ to _ie_ or _iā_, we find equivalents with _c_ and its derivatives: Gôndi _sai-_, _sā-_, Kui _sā-_, Kuvi _hā-_, Kanara _sāj-_, _sà-_, Tamil _ce-_, _cā-_, Telugu _cà-_, Tulu _sai-_. The intermediate forms with vowel-breaking, _kie-_, _kiā-_, are kept in Savara, a Kolarian tongue which has borrowed other Dravidian words. The aspiration of _khè-_, the Kurukh present-stem, seems to have been adopted from _hò-_, the present-stem of _o-_ TAKE, where the _h_ was at first an emfatic addition in the imperative. Dravidian DIE looks like a derivative of Kolarian _go'c_ DEAD.

46. Before dorsal vowels initial _s_ is lost in Kurukh-Malto but kept in Brâhui, if we may trust the following comparisons: Brâhui _saγ-_ = Malto _āh-_, Kui _sah-_ BEAT; Brâhui _sal-_ = Kurukh-Malto _il-_ STAND, apparently from _*sil_, the root of Gôndi _hillē_ NOT, Kui _si.de_ IS NOT, negation being exprest by a suffix. We find _h_ for _s_ before vowel-_l_ in Brâhui _hin-_ < _*sln_ GO; and likewise _h_ < _hN_ < _sN_ in Brâhui _hur-_ LOOK, corresponding to Kui _sū.r-_ SEE, from the root _*snu.d_. A variant of the same root, weak-strest _*s.n.d_, is perhaps represented in Brâhui _sī.r_ < _*sẽ̄.d-_ AWAIT, with a dorsal vowel developt from _.n_ early enough to let _s_ be kept, and with the vowel-change of _ī_ < _*ēn_ I. Malto has _.tu.n.d-_ < _*tu.n.d-_ < _*snu.n.d-_ SEE, with an extension of nasality like that of Spanish MANCHA < MACVLA. Ancient intervocalic _s_ is kept in Brâhui _bāmus_ NOSE, beside _bā_ MOUTH and Malto _muso_ NOSE (29); in Brâhui _xīsu-n_, Kurukh _xẽ̄sō_ = Kanara _ken_, Tamil _cè_, _cem_ RED; in Kurukh _ās_ = Kanara _ava_ < _*asan_ HE; _asan_ = Tamil _ava.n_ < _*asa.n_ THERE; _bisar_ BAD TASTE OR SMELL, beside Kanara _bevaru_ (also dissimilated _bemaru_), Tamil _vijar_ (also contracted _vēr_), Tulu _bigār_ (also under

Kanara influence _begār_) SWEAT. Ancient _s_ after a consonant is perhaps represented in Kurukh _osgā_ RAT, _xosgā_ LEG, if these are old plural-forms used as singulars, _*eusagal_ < _*el(i)saŋga.l_, _*khausagal_ < _*k(h)ālsaŋga.l_, beside Tamil _eli_ RAT, _kāl_ LEG, FOOT. Ancient _s_ is lost before a consonant in Kurukh _xott-_, the past of _xos-_ DIG, and in Brâhui _xutt-_ DIG, a former past-stem used as a verb-stem, _st_ being reduced to _tt_ in both languages. Medial _s_ has become _h_ as a final in Malto _āh_ = Kurukh _ās_ < _*asan_ HE. Final _s_ was changed to _i_ in Brâhui _bā_ < _*wāi_ = Tamil _vāj_ MOUTH, and in Kurukh _lellē_ for _*lē_ < _*.lai_ = Tamil _i.lai_ YOUNG.

47. The northernmost languages have _l_ for _.l_ : Brâhui _xul(ī)-_ FEAR beside Tamil _ku.lir-_ TREMBLE ; Kurukh _ulā_ = Kanara _o.la_ INSIDE. Brâhui has _.L_ for _l_ or _.l_ combined with _s_, perhaps a nominative-ending in _pā.L_ < _*pāls_ MILK, _tē.L_ < _*tē.ls_ SCORPION, beside Tamil _pāl_ and _tē.l_. In Brâhui _ma.L_ SON beside _mār_ SON, _.L_ seems to represent _rs_, with vowel-lengthening before a single consonant but not before a group ; these words correspond to Kanara _maRi_ CHILD, and may imply _rs_ as a source of southern _R_. Brâhui has changed _ln_ to _ll_ and _rn_ to _nn_ : _ballō_ = _balunō_ A BIG ; _xall-_ for _*xaln-_, the infinitive-stem of _xal-_ STRIKE; _hunn-_ for _*hurn-_, the infinitive-stem of _hur-_ LOOK. The influence of Aryan _nāman-_ seems to explain the change of _r_ to _n_ in Brâhui _pin_ < _*pinna_ < _*pidna_ < _*pitna_ < _*pitan_ < _*pitar_ NAME. The same foren _n_ may be represented in the Kurukh verb _pindž-_ < _*piñc-_ NAME, apparently based on a lost _*pican_ < _*pitar_.

48. A special feature of Brâhui is the development of _f_ from _p_ or _pp_ after a vowel : _harf-_ = Tamil _e.rupp-_ RAISE, but _šalāp-_ = Tamil _alamp-_ WASH. This development seems to have come from foren influence : nothern Balûchi has fricatives for occlusives after a vowel but not initially, and Brâhui lacks a native initial _f_. A loss of the checking nasal earlier than voicing of occlusives is found in _šalāp-_, probably because of weak stress ; the same development is seen in _u.t_ AM, beside Tamil _u.n.tu_ THERE IS, Telugu _u.n.d-_ BE. Tamil has _e.rump-_ RISE, implying _pp_ < _mbb_ in _e.rupp-_ (14) : we may infer that the Brâhui formation of _f_ was later than the nasal-loss connected with unvoicing of double occlusives, but earlier than the nasal-loss connected with weak stress.

49. Kurukh has adopted from Kolarian the harmonic closure of vowels : _īnim_ beside _ēnim_, the emfatic form of _ēn_ I ; _urtī_ beside _ortī_ = Tamil _orutti_ ONE.

50. Brâhui has _a_ for ancient short _e_ and ancient short _o_ : _asi_ < *_ontši_ = Tulu _ondži_ ONE; _ant_ = Tamil _ennatt-_ WHAT; _a.t_ = Kanara _e.s.tu_ HOW MUCH; _da-_ = Tulu _de-_ TAKE; _harf-_ = Tamil _e.rupp-_ RAISE; _xal-_ STRIKE beside Tamil _kol-_, Tulu _ker-_ (< *_kwel-_ ?) KILL. A recently shortened _ē_ has become _i_ in _dinnā_ < *_dērnā_ WHOSE. Nasality seems to have changed _ē_ to _ī_ : _ī_ < *_ēn_ I; _xīsu-n_ = Kurukh _xēsō_ RED; _bīn_ HUNGER beside Tamil _vē.n-_ WANT.

51

Kanara *nā(nu)* I, g *na(n)na*, d *nanage*, *nanige*, *naŋge*, ac *nanna*, *nanna(n)nu* ; earlier *ān(u)*, g *e(n)na*, d *enage*, ac *ennam*, *en(na)nu ;* plural *nāvu* (< **nām*), g *na(m)ma*, d *namage*, ac *namma(m)*, *namma(n)nu*; earlier also *āvu* < *ām*, g *e(m)ma*, d *emage*, ac *emmam*, *emmanu*, *emmu* (<**emnu*) ; —— *nī(nu)* < *nīn(u)* YOU, g *ni(n)na*, d *ninage*, *ninige*, *niŋge*, ac *ninna(m)*, *nin(na)nu*, *ninnannu* ; plural *nīvu* < *nīm*, g *ni(m)ma*, d *nimage*, ac *nimma(m)*, *nimma(n)nu*, *nimmu* (< **nimnu*)*;* —— *tā(nu)* < *tān(u)* SELF, g *ta(n)na*, d *tanage*, *tanige*, *taŋge*, ac *tanna(m)*, *tan(na)nu*, *tannannu* ; plural *tāvu* < *tām*, g *ta(m)ma*, d *tamage*, ac *tamma(m)*, *tamma(n)nu*, *tammu* (< **tamnu*).

Dravidian basic forms seem to have been *ēn*, plural *ēm*, kept unchanged in Kurukh-Malto ; **īs*, plural **isir* ; and *tān* (plural uncertain). Emfasis produced long vowels in the nominatives *ēn*, *ēm*, **īs*, *tān* ; the corresponding general stems had short vowels. In Kanara-Tamil and the northernmost tongues the regular development of final *s* to *i* or zero altered **īs* to **ī ;* the genitive **isa* became **ia*, and then **ina* under the influence of *ena*. A plural **īm*, parallel with *ēm*, was formed in most of the Dravidian tongues. Apparently all of them developt *nam* from weak-strest **in-em* YOU AND US, and outside of central Dravidian the nominative *nām* was formed from *nam*. The slight sonority of the sound *i* let weak-strest **ina* become **na* and with restressing *nā*, a form kept in Brâhui; the influence of **na* or *nā* changed **ina* to *nina*, **ī* to *nī* and **īm* to *nīm* in Kanara-Tamil and the northernmost tongues.

The form *ēn*, kept as a verb-ending with weak or variable stress in Tamil, became *jān* with main stress in Tamil and probably in Kanara. The sound *j* has been lost and replaced by hiatus-filling *v* in Kanara where it anciently stood between vowels: *bevaru* = Tamil *vijar* SWEAT; *navilu* < **mavil* = Tamil *majil* (from Prâkrit *maζùla* corresponding to Sanskrit *majūra*) PEACOCK ; *sāvira* < *sājira* (with initial *s* restored under Aryan influence) = Tamil *ājira-m* < *sahaśra* THOUSAND (10).

Kanara keeps initial *jā* only where it has been protected by forms with *jē*, a regular variant of initial *ē*, as in *jāke* = *jēke* < *ēke* WHY and *jāru* = *āru* < **ēr* < **ehar* WHO beside *jēnu* < *ēn* WHAT. We may assume that Kanara has lost initial *j* in *ān* < **jān* = Tamil *jān*, and in *ām* < **jām* = Tamil *jām*. Likewise modern Tamil, which has lost *jān* and *jām*, prefers forms with initial *ā* : *ār* for *jār* WHO, *ānai* for *jānai* < **ènas* (= Kanara *āne*) ELEFANT.

Many of the Dravidian tongues distinguish the simple or exclusive plural WE and the compound or inclusive plural YOU AND WE. In the fourth volume of the *Linguistic Survey of India* Konow says that the distinction is lacking in Kanara, Gôndi, and Brâhui, and probably was not a basic feature of Dravidian speech. But Trench tells us that Gôndi does make the distinction. The compound plural is represented, as a matter of form, in Kanara and Brâhui. We may infer that these languages have lost the special meaning of the inclusive plural, and that the distinction of the two plurals was a basic feature of Dravidian. Modern Kanara has lost the simple plural *āvu* ; the influence of *nāvu* has changed *ānu* to *nānu*, with a corresponding general stem *nan-*. In preliterary Kanara the influence of *ān* or **jān* changed **nī* to *nīn*; modern *nī*, rarely used for *nīnu*, is a development from *nīn*. The nominatives **ī* < **īs* and **īr* < **isir* are represented in verb-endings, *-i*, *-aj*, *-e*, and *-ir*(*i*).

Simple stem-finals, *n* and *m*, were used in the genitive and dative of early Dravidian pronouns. The doubling found in Kanara genitives seems to have resulted from the accidental likeness of genitives and accusatives. A late formation of the accusative in Kanara-Tamil is shown by the doubling of stem-finals in pronouns as in substantives (16); the genitive and dative were developt earlier than the principle of doubling. Hungarian *-t* is a demonstrative that has become the accusative-ending. Likewise Dravidian accusative-endings seem to have come from **asan* THAT : Kanara *-an*, with the variants *-àm*, *-à*, *-anu*, *-annu* and the double endings *-ana*, *-anna*, may represent **ahn-* < **asn* < **asan* before vowels, while Tamil *-ai* looks like the derivative of **as* < **asa* < **asan* before a consonant or a pause. The accusative *ennu* and the parallel contracted forms are found in early Kanara before *-vam* TOO.

Variants of *m*-forms having *v* are said to occur in early Kanara texts. The interchange of *m* and *v* in Kanara seems to be mainly dissimilative, as in *bemaru* = *bevaru* (< **wisàr*) SWEAT, *ka.n.neve* = *ka.n.neme* (Tamil *ka.n.nimai*) EYELID. We should expect to find *v*-variants of *nam-*, *nim-*, but Kittel's dictionary gives only *ev-* = *em-* and *tav-* = *tam-*. In Kanara script the *m*-symbol differs from the *v*-symbol by the addition of a single stroke: the supposed *v*-variants of the pronouns may be merely scribal blunders. Modern Kanara has *tavar mane*, *tavara mane*, *tavaru mane*, *tavuru mane* OWN FOLKS' HOUSE, by dissimilation from *tamar(a) mane*, *tamaru mane;* and *tavar mane* is said to be ancient. In modern *tavar ūru*, *tavur ūru*, for older *tamar ūr* OWN FOLKS' VILLAGE, the change of *m* to *v* may have come from the influence of *tavar mane*.

52

Tamil *nān* < *jān* I, g *ennin*, *ennu.taija* earlier *ena(tu)*, d *enakku*, ac *ennai*; plural inclusive *nām*, g *nammin*, *nammu.taija* earlier *nama(tu)*, d *namakku*, ac *nammai;* exclusive *nāŋka.l* < *jāŋka.l*, g *eŋka.l-in*, *-u-.taija* earlier *-a(tu)*, d *eŋka.lukku*, *eŋka.tku* (14), ac *eŋka.lai;* also *jām*, g *ema(tu)*, d *emakku*, ac *emmai;* — *nī* YOU, general stems *un-*, *nin-*, inflected like *en-;* plural *nīŋka.l*, general stem *uŋka.l-*, inflected like *eŋka.l-;* honorific *nīr*, *nīvir*, *nījir*, general stems *um-*, *num-*, inflected like *nam-;* — *tān*, *tan-* SELF; plural *tām*, *tam-*, and *tāŋka.l*, *taŋka.l-;* general stems inflected like *en-*, *nam-*, *eŋka.l-*.

In Tamil the influence of *nām* changed *jān* to *nān*, and the double plural *jāŋka.l* to *nāŋka.l*, without disturbing the general stems *en-*, *eŋka.l-*. The ending *-ka.l*, regularly used for the plural of neuter substantives in Tamil, is often added to other plurals, as in *jāŋka.l* for *jām*, *nīŋka.l* for *_nīm_, *avarka.l* for *avar* THOSE. Tamil grammars ignore the form *jāŋka.l*, and call obsolete *jām* a variant of *nām*. From Subbaiya's statements in the second number of *Dravidic Studies* we learn that early writers used *jāŋka.l*, and made a distinction between inclusive *nām* and exclusive *jām*. The Tamil forms and the preliterary Kanara equivalents, *_nām_ and *_jām_ (51), corresponded perfectly to the inclusive *nām* and exclusive *ēm* of Kurukh-Malto.

Tamil formed the genitive *nina* by blending *_ina_ and *_nà_, in accord with Kanara. It also expanded *_nà_ to *una*, with initial *u* taken from the end of preceding words. Apparently the genitive *_ima_ became *uma* by a parallel development or under the influence of *una*. We might however assume a direct change of *_ima_ to *uma*, with *u* produced by contact with a labial, as in *mucal* < *_mital_ HARE. The *n-* of the singular was extended to the plural: *num-* < *um-;* *_nīm_ < *_īm;_ *nīr*, *_nivir_, *_nijir_ < *_isir_. Later *nīvir* and *nījir* took *ī* from the contracted *nīr*.

According to Vinson, in early Tamil the uninflected stems could be used for the genitive and the accusative; their use as genitive-equivalents is common in modern Tamil. Early forms mentioned by Vinson are *eRku* = *enakku; niRku* = *ninakku; taRku* = *tanakku;* and *nēkku* = *ĕnakku*, with a vowel-change of the kind often found in Telugu. The form *nēkku* and a parallel *nōkku* for *unakku* are said to be used in the modern language. Uninflected genitive-equivalents are found in modern Kanara, but they seem to be reduced from forms in *-a*, while the Tamil forms represent the use of simple stems as the first portion of compounds.

53

Badaga *nā̃* I, g ac *enna*, d *enaga;* plural inclusive *naŋga*, g *ṅaŋga*, d *naŋgaga*, ac *naŋg.ruva;* exclusive *eŋga*, inflected like *naŋga;* — *nī* YOU, g ac *ninna*, d *ninaga;* plural *niŋga*, inflected like *naŋga;* — *tā̃* SELF, g ac *tanna*, d *tanaga;* plural *taŋga*, inflected like *naŋga*.

The nominative *niŋga* has the variant *ṅiŋg.ru-jē̆* in combination with emfasizing *-ĕ*. The other plurals evidently have corresponding forms. The ending *-g.ru* is a variant of the ordinary plural-ending of substantives, *-g.ro*, g *-g.ro*, *-g.rova*, *-g.ruva*, d *-g.ròga*, ac *-g.rova*, *-g.ruva*. Spoken Tamil has *-go* for the plural-ending written as *-ka.l:* Badaga *-g.ro* is derived from a similar **-go.l*. The older form of the genitive is *-g.ro* < **-g.rō* < **-go.la;* as *-a* is the regular genitive-ending, it was added to *-g.ro*, and produced *-g.rova*, *-g.ruva*, with hiatus-filling *v*. A tendency to alter weak *o* to *u* before consonants is shown by *-g.ruva* = *-g.rova* and by *-g.ru-jē̆* beside *-g.ro*.

Instead of *-ga*, *-ga*, *-gaga*, *-g.ruva*, earlier Badaga probably had *-g.ro*, *-g.ro*, *-g.ròga*, *-g.rova*, in pronouns as in substantives. The old forms are kept, with *u* for *o*, in the accusative *-g.ruva* and in the emfatic nominative *-g.ru-jē̆*. A foren influence brought in *-ga* as a variant of *-g.ro;* the likeness of nominative and genitive *-g.ro* produced the genitive *-ga*, and the dative became *-gaga*. The foren influence was apparently Kêlan. Kodagu has the plurals *naŋga*, *eŋga*, *niŋga*, *taŋga*, in accord with Badaga. Kodagu and Badaga are in contact with Kêlan, which has plurals representing older **naŋga.l*, **eŋga.l*, **niŋga.l*, **taŋga.l*. Apparently these forms were adopted in Badaga and Kodagu. Badaga lacks final consonants in pausal word-forms; Kodagu shows a loss of final *.l* in *ava* = Tamil *ava.l* SHE. In both languages the Kêlan plurals lost final *.l* because it did not harmonize with their sound-systems; in Badaga the development was later than its normal change of *-*a.l* to -*.ra* (19). A variant of Badaga *naŋga* is *aŋga*, apparently developt under the influence of *eŋga*. The inclusive sense of *naŋga* in Badaga and Kodagu, contrary to exclusive *ñàŋŋa.l* < **nàŋga.l* in Kêlan, shows that *naŋga* has replaced an older **nām* in both languages ; the formal likeness of **nām* and *naŋga* caused the latter to be used with the inclusive value.

Badaga *tã* is used also as an emfasizing suffix without inflexion : *evaka-tã* THESE, *aduna-tã* THAT (ac), *atte-tã* SO.

In the singular the Badaga nominatives resemble the Tamil forms, but were probably taken from preliterary Kanara before **nī* changed to *nīn*. The other forms of the singular agree with the Kanara equivalents, and cannot have come from Kêlan or Tamil.

54

Kêlan *ñān* I, g *enRe*, d *enakku*, *enikku* and with assimilation *inikku*, ac *enne ;* plural inclusive *nām*, *nam-*, *namm- ;* also *nōm*, *nomm-*, *numm-* and with dissimilation *novv- ;* also *namma.l*, *nomma.l*, *numma.l*, *ñamma.l*, with -*a.l* from the exclusive forms ; exclusive *eŋŋa.l*, *ñaŋŋa.l*, *ñāŋŋa.l* and with contraction *ñā.lu* (d *ñākku*) ; — *nī*, *nin-*, *ninn-* YOU ; plural *niŋŋa.l*, also *nimma.l* based on **nīm* = Kanara *nīm ;* — *tān*, *tan-*, *tann-* SELF ; plural *tām*, *tam-*, *tamm-*, and *taŋŋa.l*, *tāŋŋa.l*, *tāŋka.l*.

Extension of nasality changed *j* to *ñ* in *ñān* <**jān ;* its *ñ* has by analogy replaced *n* in some of the plural forms. In *nomm-*, *novv-*, *numm-*, weak stress and the influence of a following labial produced *o* and *u*, as in Italian DOPO, Rumanian DUPĂ <**dopo* < DE POST. Apparently *nōm* was constructed from *nomm-*, on the model of *nām* beside *namm- ;* it has the datives *nōmku* and *nōkku* based on the nominative. Kêlan *ŋŋ* regularly represents *ŋg*<*ŋk*.

55

Kodagu *nạ̄nï* I, g *enna.da*, *ē.da*, d *enakï*, ac *enna ;* plural inclusive *naŋga*, g -*.da*, d -*kï*, ac -*.la ;* exclusive *eŋga*, inflected like *naŋga ;* — *nīnï* YOU, g *ninna.da*, *nī.da*, d *ninakï*, ac *ninna ;* plural *niŋga*, inflected like *naŋga ;* — *tānï* SELF, g *tanna.da*, *tā(.n).da*, d *tanakï*, ac *tanna ;* plural *taŋga*, inflected like *naŋga*. (The final vowel of the dative is uncertain ; it is perhaps *ë* rather than *ï*.)

Aside from the short genitives, these Kodagu forms were probably taken from Kêlan, Tamil, or a Tamil-like dialect, and later adapted to the Kanara forms. Kodagu -*.da* is a common genitive-ending ; its basis is found in *ava.da* < **ava.lda* HER and the ordinary plural-ending *-a* < **-a.l*, g *-a.da* < **a.lda*. The long forms of the singular genitive have added the Kodagu ending to earlier **enna*, **ninna*, **tanna;* the short forms have added it to bases which seem to point to Telugu as the source of Kodagu.

Old final consonants are lost in Kodagu, except where they are preserved by the addition of a Kanara-like vowel. Earlier Kodagu probably had **ē* < **ēn* = Telugu *ēnu* I, g **nā* = Telugu *nā*, and **ī* < *īs* = Telugu *īvu* YOU, g **nī* = Telugu *nī*. In Telugu and Kui the change of **ina* to *nī* produced a common genitive-ending *-i* beside older *-à*. In Kodagu the formal likeness of **nī* and **ī* produced **nē* for **nā* as the genitive of **ē*. This **nē* became **nē.da*, with the usual Kodagu ending, and then *ē.da* under the influence of the general stem *en-*. A Gôndi or Kui basis would explain Kodagu *nī.da* < **nī ;* but *ē.da* seems to require a Telugu basis, as ancient *ē* has become *ā* in Kui *ānu* < **ēn* and Gôndi *anā* < **ēnēn* I. The short genitives of *tānï* are analogic, modeled on *ē.da* and *nī.da*.

[Addendum : In *Mysore and Coorg* III (1878), B. L. Rice gives Kodagu *nāŋgï*, *nīŋgï*, *tāŋgï*, as variants of the dative ; these are apparently native developments, based on the nominative.]

56

Telugu *nēnu* < *ēnu* I, g *nā* < **ena*, d *nāku* < **enakku*, ac *na(n)nu* < **enan ;* plural inclusive *manamu* < **nām*, g *mana* < **manâ* < **nama*, d *manaku* < **namakku*, ac *man(al)anu* < **naman ;* exclusive *mēmu* < *nēmu* < *ēmu*, g *mā* < **ema*, d *māku* < **emakku*, ac *ma(m)munu*, *ma(m)mu* < **eman ;* — *nīvu* < *īvu* YOU, g *nī* < **ini* < **ina*, d *nīku* < **inakku*, ac *ni(n)nu* < **inan ;* plural *mīr(al)u* < *īr(al)u*, g *mī* < **imi* < **ima*, d *mīku* < **imakku*, ac *mi(m)munu*, *mi(m)mu* < **iman ;* — *tānu* SELF, g *tana*, d *tanaku*, ac *tan(u)nu* ; plural *tāmu*, g *tama*, d *tamaku*, ac *ta(m)munu*, *tammu* ; also *tāru*, *tamaru*, g *tamari*, d *tamariki*, ac *tamarini*.

Modern Kanara adds a vowel after former final consonants : *ava.lu* < *ava.l* SHE, *avaru* < *avar* THEY. A similar development took place in preliterary Telugu ; final *u* is perhaps a fairly recent addition after *l*, *r*, or a nasal. The *u* of *nīku* and *mīku* is contrary to the otherwise unbroken rule that *-ku* becomes *-ki* after an *i*-sound in Telugu ; it is kept from the older forms in **-akku*. In *īvu* < **īsu* < **īs*, Telugu agrees with Kui (and perhaps Gôndi) in showing a development of *-u* earlier than the loss of *s ;* in Telugu *tala* < **talas* HEAD, we may assume a still earlier loss of *-_s_ after a weak vowel, or a development thru *_talasu_, *_talau_, *_talā_. The -_ru_ of _tāru_ and _tamaru_ represents an older final _r_ taken from *_īr_ when *_īm_ was in use as a variant of *_īr_.

The Telugu datives, based on Tamil-like forms in *-_akku_, have been conformed to the corresponding genitives; _k_ for _kk_ is normal after a weak-strest or long vowel. The assimilation in *_ini_ for *_ina_ and *_imi_ for *_ima_ is a remarkable feature of Gôndi, Kui, and Telugu; it is the source of the genitive-ending -_į_ (replacing -_a_) found in Kui and Telugu. In early Telugu, stress-displacement was common, and changed *_ena_ to _nā_, *_nama_ to *_manâ_, *_ema_ to _mā_, *_ini_ to _nī_, *_imi_ to _mī_. The change of *_nama_ to *_manâ_, with a sound-displacement accompanying stress-displacement as in _vrēlu_ <*_veral_ <*_wiral_ = Tamil _viral_ FINGER, produced a general stem _mana_-.

Inclusive *_nām_(_u_) became *_manām_(_u_) and later _manamu_. The initial nasals of the other modern nominatives came from the general stems after these had lost their initial vowels; that of _nēmu_ came from *_nām_(_u_), which was perhaps also a partial source of the added _n_- of _nēnu_, in accord with Kanara and Tamil developments. In _ma_(_m_)_mu_ for *_ma_(_n_)_nu_ and _mi_(_ṁ_)_mu_ for *_mi_(_n_)_nu_ the assimilation of _n_ to _m_ seems to have resulted from a feeling that _nanu_ and _ninu_ contained a repeated radical (in the style of Latin SESE). The _l_-suffix of _manalanu_ and (_m_)_īralu_ was taken from the ordinary inflection of substantives.

57

Tulu _jān_ I, g _ena_, d _eŋkï_, ac _enan_; plural inclusive _nama_, g _nama_, d _naŋkï_, ac _naman_; exclusive _eŋku.lu_, g _eŋku.le_, d _eŋku.legï_, ac _eŋku-.len_; — _ī_ YOU, g _nina_, d _nikkï_, ac _ninan_; plural _niku.lu_, inflected like _eŋku.lu_; honorific _īr_, g _īre_, d _īregï_, ac _īren_; — _tān_ SELF, g _tana_, d _tankï_, ac _tanan_; plural _tan_(_u_)_ku.lu_, inflected like _eŋku.lu_.

In most of the Dravidian tongues case-endings are alike for singular and plural. Tulu has in the singular the genitive-ending -_a_ found elsewhere, but the ending of the plural genitive is always -_e_ (perhaps -_ę_ < *-_ai_), except in _nama_. This seems to show that _nama_ was taken from Kanara or Tamil, replacing a Gôndi-like or Kui-like form. It may be suspected that the older Tulu forms were g *_manai_, d *_maŋkŭ_, ac *_manan_, with a stem corresponding to Telugu _man_- (< *_nam_-), Kui _amm_- < _amn_- < *_man_- (< *_nam_-), and with a genitive-ending found in Kui _nai_ (beside _nā_) MY and _mai_ (beside _mā_) OUR. As Tulu has _mara_ = Tamil _maram_ TREE, the nominative _nama_ may represent

**manȧ* < **manām*, made up from the general stem and the ending of Kanara **nām* or Tamil *nām*.

It is not clear whether a native treatment of final *s* is shown in Tulu *tarẹ* < **talas* HEAD (38). Perhaps the seeming conservatism of *ī* < **īs* hides a development like that of Kui **īs*, thru **īsu* and **īu*. The form *nikkï* is remarkable : we should expect **niŋkï*, parallel with *eŋkï*. Apparently it corresponds to Gôndi *nīk*, Telugu *nīku*, without the long vowel that these have taken from the genitive *nī*, and implies a form **nī* as the genitive in early Tulu. This would seem to imply **nā* as the older form of Tulu *ena*, and a borrowing of *nin-*, *en-*, and perhaps *jān*, *eŋku.l-*, from Tamil or Kanara.

Tulu stands alone in the use of *īr* as a general stem: elsewhere the derivatives of **isir* are restricted to the nominative-vocative. Tulu *niku.lu* is likewise isolated. If **ārku.lu* is represented by Tulu *āku.lu*, apparently a double plural beside the simple *ār* THOSE, we might assume a double plural **īrku.lu*, which became **īku.lu*, and then *niku.lu* under the influence of *nina*, *nikkï*, *ninan*. Parallel with **ēm* WE, most of the Dravidian tongues developt **īm* as an equivalent of **isir*. Tulu shows no trace of **īm*, which would have made **iŋku.lu* or **niŋku.lu*, in accord with *eŋku.lu*, instead of *niku.lu*.

In the Tulu possessives, *ennau*, *nammau*, *ninnau*, *tannau*, the consonant-doubling looks like a borrowing from Kanara equivalents, *ennadu*, *nammadu*, *ninnadu*, *tannadu*; Tulu *au* corresponds to Kanara *adu* THAT. But Tulu has *-nau* as a regular possessive-ending, with *n* generalized from former *n*-stems, as in *mag-* SON, with the genitive *maga* and the possessive *maganau*, beside Kanara *magan-*, genitive *magana*, possessive *maganadu*. The form *maganau* agrees with *maganadu*; but Tulu has *mag-*, except in the possessive, for *magan-* = Kanara *magan-*, so that the Tulu ending is *-nau* in addition to the genitive, while the Kanara ending is simply *-du*, the formal equivalent of Tulu *-u*. Probably *-nnau* is a contraction of **-nanau* in the forms mentioned. Kui has *amm-* as a variant of *amn-* < **man-* < **nam-* = Tulu *nam-* US : likewise Tulu seems to have *mm* as a normal development from *mn* in *nammau*.

[Addendum : Männer gives Tulu *ēn* as a variant of *jān*.]

58

Gôndi *a(n)nā* I, g *nāvōr*, d ac *nāk(un)* ; plural inclusive *aplō̆*, g *aplōtōr*, d ac *aplōtun* ; exclusive *ammȧ.t*, g *māvōr*, d ac *māk(un)* ; — *immā* YOU, g *nīvōr*, d ac *nīk(un)*; plural *immȧ.t*, g *mīvōr*, d ac *mīk(un)*;

— *tanā̀* SELF, g *tanvōr*, d ac *aplōtun ;* plural *tammà.t*, g *tammōr*, d ac *aplōtun*.

Gôndi has *ma.rā* = Tamil *maram*, Telugu *mrānu* TREE. The loss of final nasals gave or would have given **ā* < **ēn* with the plural **ā* < **ēm*, and **ī* < **īs* with the plural **ī* < **īm*. A partial remedy was ſound in the use of doubled forms : *anā* < **ēnēn*, **amā* < **ēmēm*. This treatment could not be applied to **ī* < **īs*, since ancient medial *s* disappeared along with final *s* in Gôndi. We may assume that a plural **imī* < **īmīm* developt the singular **imā* or older **imē* under the influence of *anā* or older **anē* < **ēnēn*. Trench gives *annā* as an emfatic variant of *anā* : emfasis changed **amā* to **ammā* and **imā* to *immā*. A difference of stress explains the verb-endings *-ān* < **-āna* < **-ēnēn* and *-ām* < **-āma* < **-ēmēm* beside the pronouns *anā* and **amā*.

Developments like those of Telugu are seen in Gôndi *nā-*, *mā-*, *nī-*, *mī-*. Gôndi must have formerly had the same genitives as Telugu : the added *-vōr* is a variant of *(v)ōl* THAT. From the Gôndi verb-ending *-à.t* for inclusive WE, we may infer a former pronoun **à.t* corresponding to Kui *ādžu*. After the adoption of foren *aplō* (= Hindi *āplōg*) the meaning of **à.t* was forgotten and it was suffixt to **ammā*. The same ending has been adopted by *immà.t* and *tammà.t*. The influence of *anā* is seen in *tanā* for **tā* < **tān ;* and that of **ammā* in *tammā*, a variant of *tammà.t*. Dialectal variants of the other nominatives are *nannā* = *annā*, with *n-* from the general stem ; *a(m)mō.t* = *ammà.t*, also *mammā.t*, *mamē.t*, with *m-* from the stem ; *immē* = *immā*, also *nimē* with *n-* from the stem, and a plural *nimē.t*. Kôi, a Gôndi dialect in contact with Telugu, has inclusive *mana.da* WE, with *man-* as in Telugu and *-a.da* having the proper value of **à.t*. Gôndi has *-ī* < **īs* as a verb-ending, and also as a predicative : *immā bēnd-ī* WHERE ARE YOU ? literally YOU WHERE-YOU ? Likewise *-ī* is the vocative-ending of Gôndi nouns.

59

Kui *ānu* I, g *nā*, *nai*, d ac *naŋgē* ; plural inclusive *ādžu*, g *ammāni*, d ac *ammaŋgē* ; exclusive *āmu*, g *mā*, *mai* d ac *maŋgē* ; — *īnu* YOU, g *nī*, d ac *niŋgē* ; plural *īru*, g *mī*, d ac *miŋgē ;* — *tānu* SELF, g ac *tānā*, d *tānāki* ; plural *tāru*, g ac *tārā*, d *tārāki*.

These are the forms given by the *Linguistic Survey*. Most of them show close agreement with Telugu. The genitive-ending *-i*, which may become *-ni* after a vowel, has been explained above in connection with the Telugu genitive (57).

Friend-Pereira gives the same nominatives, with slightly different inflections: g *nāì*, *ana(n)i*, d *anaŋki*, d ac *nāŋge*, *anaŋge*, and parallel forms for *āmu* ; g *amnā(n)i*, d *amnāniki*, d ac *amnāŋge* ; — g *nī(ì)*, d *inaniki*, d ac *nīŋge* ; g *mī(ì)*, d ac *mīŋge* ; — for singular and plural, g *tāna(n)i*, d *tānaniki*, d ac *tāŋge*. It is not clear whether *ana-*, *ama-*, and *ina-* represent the ancient stems or were reconstructed from the nominatives. In the stem *amn-* (< **man-* < **nam-*) we see the older form of *amm-*.

Winfield gives *ānu*, g *nāi*, d ac *nāŋg-i*, *-e*, ac *nā.n.dāni* ; plural inclusive *ā̇dȥu*, with inflected forms belonging to *āmu* ; exclusive *āmu*, g *māi*, d ac *māŋg-i*, *-e*, ac *mā.n.dāni*, *māmbā.n.di* ; — *īnu*, g *nī*, d ac *nīŋg-i*, *-e*, ac *nī.n.dāni* ; *īru*, g *mī*, d ac *mīŋg-i*, *-e*, ac *mī.n.dāni*, *mīmbā.n.di* ; — *tānu*, plural masculine *tāru*, feminine and neuter *tāi*, with the same set of inflections for all three, g *tā.ra*, d *t.rāŋgi*, ac *tā̇.rāni*. The long vowels of the genitives have been extended to the other cases, in accord with the treatment of datives in Gôndi and Telugu.

Kui *ādȥu* seems to represent **āndru* or **āndriu*, a compound of *ānu* and *īru*, with *dȥ* for *dr* as in *mùndȥi* = Tamil *mūnRu* THREE. Kui developt **īu* < **īsu* < **īs* in agreement with Telugu ; the further change to *īnu* came from the influence of *ānu*. Vinson gives Tamil *nambo* as a variant of spoken *naŋga.l* (= *eŋka.l*) OUR, apparently with *-bo* < **-gwo* for *-go*, another equivalent of *-ga.l* < *-ka.l*. A similar development is perhaps represented in Kuvi *māmbu* WE, *mīmbu* YOU, and the Kui accusatives containing *mb* as given by Winfield.

60

Kuvi *nānu* I, g *nā*, d *naŋge*, ac *nanaˀa* ; plural inclusive *māro*, g *mā*, d *maŋge*, ac *mamaˀa*, *mamaˀi* ; exclusive *māmbu*, g *mā*, d *maŋge*, ac *mamaˀa*, *mamaˀi* ; — *nīnu* YOU, g *nī*, d *niŋge*, ac *ninaˀa* ; plural *mīmbu(ŋgo)*, *nīnuŋga*, g *mī*, d *miŋge*, ac *mimaˀa*, *mimaˀi* ; — *tānu* SELF, g *tani*, d *taŋge*, ac *tanaˀa*, *tanaˀi*, *tanati* ; plural *tāmbu*, g *tami*, d *tamge*, ac *tamaˀa*, *tamaˀi*, *tamati*.

Most of the Kuvi forms can be explained from the Kui or Telugu equivalents. The nominatives have the initial stem-consonants, in accord with Telugu.

61

Parji *ān* I, g *an* ; plural *am*, g *am* ; — *in* YOU, g *in* ; plural *im*, g *im*.

Probably all of the nominatives should be written with long vowels. The genitives may be compared with the uninflected forms of Tamil, explained above.

62

Kolâmi *ān* I, g *anna ;* plural *ām*, g *amma ; —* (*n*)*īva* YOU, g *inna ;* plural *īm*, g *imma.*

The forms *īva* and *nīva* were taken from Telugu. The genitives fail to show the Gôndi-Kui development, but they might have been reconstructed from the nominatives *ān, ām, *īn, īm.*

63

Kurukh *ēn* I, g *eŋhai*, d *eŋgā*(*gē*), ac *eŋgan ;* plural inclusive *nām*, g *namhai, naŋhai*, d *naŋgā*(*gē*), ac *naman ;* exclusive *ēm*, g *emhai*, d *emā*(*gē*), ac *eman ;* — *nīn* YOU, plural *nīm*, inflected like *ēn* and *ēm ;* — *tān* SELF, plural *tām*, inflected like *ēn* and *ēm*.

In Kurukh-Malto a *g*-suffix has been added to the stems of these words in the singular. This added element seems to represent a dative-ending ; probably it stands for older *k*, with normal voicing after nasals, and corresponds to the *k*-prefix of Brâhui *kane* ME. Kurukh has added the suffix also to the plural *nam-*.

The genitive-ending *-a* or *-ā*, found in the other main divisions of Dravidian, appears to be lacking in Kurukh-Malto, except that it is represented in the compound ending *-antā*, which may contract to *-tā*, used in Kurukh to form adjective-like genitives : *ulantā* and *ultā* OF THE INSIDE, from *ulā ; ullantā* and *ultā* OF THE DAY, OF [MANY] DAYS, OLD, from *ullā*. But really the Dravidian genitive-ending is kept in the dative of Kurukh pronouns. The old genitive has become a dative in Kurukh-Malto, just as Latin has produced a Romanic dative from ILLORVM. Final vowels are generally lengthened in Kurukh — or shortened elsewhere? —, so that *emā* is the exact formal equivalent of Kanara-Tamil *ema*, Gôndi-Kui and Telugu *mā* < **ema*. The word *eŋgāgē* contains a genitive-ending turned dative, apparently combined with two real dative-endings.

The development of *nīn* and *nīm* is parallel with what is found in Kanara. Kurukh has the equivalent verb-endings *-ai* and *-ar*, indicating a formation of **ī* from **īs* and of **īr* from **isir* in Kurukh-Malto as elsewhere. Ancient medial *s* is kept in Kurukh *ās* = Kanara *ava* < **asan* HE, *asan* = Tamil *ava.n* < **asa.n* THERE. The normal change of **īs* to **ī* produced analogic **ia* for **isa* and **ir* for **isir* in

Kurukh-Malto and Brâhui ; elsewhere the medial *s* would have disappeared as a normal sound-change, without regard to the influence of **ī* < **īs*.

The forms given above are taken from Hahn's grammar. Grignard mentions *emā* used as a 'contraction of *emhai*' : really it is the old genitive with its proper value. Likewise Grignard gives *namā* (= *naŋgā*) and *nimā* as genitives. The emfatic nominative *ēnim* has the variant *īnim*, with the harmonic vowel-closure that is so common in Kurukh.

64

Malto *ēn* I, g *eŋ*(*ki*), d *eŋge*, ac *eŋgen ;* plural inclusive *nām*, g *nam*(*ki*), d *name*, ac *namen ;* exclusive *ēm*, inflected like *nām ;* — *nīn* YOU, plural *nīm*, inflected like *ēn* and *ēm;* — *tāni* SELF, plural *tāmi*, inflected like *ēn* and *ēm*, with *-i* added to the nominative.

Malto has changed weak *a* to *e*. In its general treatment of the stems it agrees closely with Kurukh. It has the verb-endings *-e* and *-er* corresponding to Kurukh *-ai*, *-ar*.

[Addendum *:* In the *Gospel of St. John in Rājmahali* (1882), Malto *tān* and *tām* are used as variants of *tāni*, *tāmi*.]

65

Brâhui *ī* I, g *kanā*, d ac *kane ;* plural *nan*, g *nanā*, d ac *nane ;* — *nī* YOU, g *nā*, d ac *ṅē ;* plural *num*, g *numā*, d ac *nume ;* — *tēn* SELF, g *tēnā*, d ac *tēne ;* plural same.

Brâhui *xīsun* RED, beside Kurukh *xē̃sō* and Tamil *cè* (< **kens-*), shows the same vowel-change as *ī* < **ẽn*. The loss of final nasals confused the Brâhui derivatives of **ēn* and **ēm*. The simple plural was replaced by **nā* < **nām ;* the stem **nam-* became *nan-* under the influence of the singular, and was used for the nominative because **nā* conflicted with *nā* < **ina* YOUR. The objective *kane* represents an accusative **enai* < **enas* combined with the *k*-formant of the dative. The use of a prefix, instead of a suffix, may be compared with our THEREBY = BY THAT ; Latin MECVM ; Hungarian NEKEM (literally MY TONESS) instead of *EMNEK OT *ENNEK (TO ME). The *k* of *kanā* was taken from *kane*.

Brâhui *nī* < **ī* and *nā* < **ina* < **ia* correspond to the developments found in Kanara-Tamil. Probably early Brâhui had **nīr* < **īr* and **um-* < **im-* in accord with Tamil. The influence of **nīr* changed **um-* to *num-*, but **nīr* became **nī* before consonants, parallel with *dē(r)* WHO, which corresponds to Kanara *dāru* (from **ehar* with prefixt *d*) and loses its *r* before consonants. The reduction of **nīr* to **nī*, making conflict with the singular, led to the use of *num* for the nominative.

Corresponding to *nī*, Brâhui has the verb-ending *-s* derived from **isis* or **īsīs* : final *s* became *i* (or zero after an *i*-sound), but ancient medial *s* is kept in Brâhui as in Kurukh-Malto.

Reduced forms of the pronouns are used as weak-strest suffixes for genitive, dative, and accusative: *-ka* for *kanā*, *kane*; *-ne* for *nā*, *nē* and for the third person *-ta(n)*, plural *-tā*, perhaps connected with *tēn*.

PROTAT BROTHERS, PRINTERS, MACON (FRANCE). — MCMXXX